



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,617	05/14/2001	Yohnosuke Furui	JP9-2000-0025-JP1 (8728-5)	9199
22150	7590	05/26/2006	EXAMINER	
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC 130 WOODBURY ROAD WOODBURY, NY 11797			POLLACK, MELVIN H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	Application No. 09/854,617	Applicant(s) FURUI ET AL.	
	Examiner Melvin H. Pollack	Art Unit 2145	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 5/5/06 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 17-25.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached office action.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


JASON CARDONE
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER MHP

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 5/5/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. An analysis of the arguments is provided below.
2. Applicant alleges that Knaft fails to disclose a search engine robot, and the determination as to whether the transmission source is a search engine robot. One of ordinary skill in the art would know that a search engine robot is by definition also called a spider. Knaft teaches that "Selected ones of the IR systems 208A-208M use a software program called a "spider" (not shown) to survey the electronic resources that are stored by the computers connected to the network 116, such as the server computer 110... The spider follows all of the hypertext links in each of the electronic documents of the server until all of the electronic documents have been read (col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 10)." Knaft further teaches a mechanism for determining whether the request comes from an IR system (and by extension, a spider) or by a user (col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 15). Applicant has failed to show, either in the claims or specification, functionality of the applicant's search engine robot that is not performed by Knaft's Information Retrieval (IR) system spider. Therefore, Knaft reads on this limitation.
3. Applicant alleges that Knaft does not expressly disclose Applicant's claimed element of metadata, because Knaft dynamically generates an electronic document having index information relating to the data object (P. 9, lines 11-20).
4. Knaft teaches that, "as defined herein, the term "dynamically generates" comprises either (i) preparing in real-time an electronic document or (ii) transmitting a pre-prepared electronic document that is associated with the URL and that is customized particularly for a

Art Unit: 2145

selected requestor... the server computer 110 maintains a database 210 that stores metadata for each of the data objects 216A-216N (col. 6, lines 25-30 and 35-40).” Therefore, Knauft teaches that the metadata, in at least one embodiment, is similar to the metadata prepared in advance of the request that the applicant wishes to claim.

5. Applicant suggests that “index information that is prepared dynamically at the time of a request *typically* incorporates terms from the request.” Applicant fails to provide any evidence that this is typical. More importantly, the examiner does not interpret typical to mean always or even almost always. And while other inventors may typically add this limitation, the applicant fails to point to any evidence showing that Knauft has added this limitation, and the examiner can find no portion of Knauft that teaches this limitation. Applicant further fails to explain why metadata prepared in advance of a request cannot incorporate terms from a request, assuming the preparer would know the terms, searching techniques, or search engines likely to encounter the position. It is not sufficient to show that Knauft has added functionality over the instant application. Instead, applicant must show that the added functionality would hinder or teach away from the functionality as claimed.

6. In further response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that metadata is prepared in advance of the request from a spider, rather than be prepared in real-time, and that such metadata cannot incorporate terms from the request) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 2145

7. In further response to applicant's argument that "metadata must be prepared in advance and not incorporate terms from the request," a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

8. In further response to applicant's argument that Knauft does not teach metadata prepared in advance, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). It has been shown, and not challenged, that Bienvenu, the primary reference, teaches metadata of the type desired by the applicant. Therefore, absent evidence that the Knauft techniques would destroy Bienvenu, the absence of metadata prepared in advance within Knauft, shown above to be both inaccurate and irrelevant, is insufficient to overturn the rejection.

9. Therefore, the rejection is maintained for the reasons above, and remains unchanged.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melvin H. Pollack whose telephone number is (571) 272-3887. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 M-F.

Art Unit: 2145

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MHP
19 May 2006